

1 **HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP**
2 Shana E. Scarlett (Bar No. 217895)
shanas@hbsslaw.com
3 715 Hearst Avenue, Suite 300
Berkeley, CA 94710
4 Telephone: (510) 725-3000

5 **QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &**
6 **SULLIVAN, LLP**
7 Kevin Y. Teruya (Bar No. 235916)
kevinteruya@quinnemanuel.com
8 865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
9 Telephone: (213) 443-3000

10 **WILMER CUTLER PICKERING**
HALE AND DORR LLP
11 Sonal N. Mehta (SBN 222086)
Sonal.Mehta@wilmerhale.com
12 2600 El Camino Real, Suite 400
Palo Alto, California 94306
Telephone: (650) 858-6000

13 David Z. Gringer (*pro hac vice*)
David.Gringer@wilmerhale.com
14 Paul Vanderslice (*pro hac vice*)
Paul.Vanderslice@wilmerhale.com
15 7 World Trade Center
250 Greenwich Street
16 New York, New York 10007
Telephone: (212) 230-8800

17 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs Maximilian Klein,*
Rachel Banks Kupcho, and Sarah Grabert

18 *Attorneys for Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.*

19 [Additional counsel listed on signature page]

20 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
21 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
22 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

23 MAXIMILIAN KLEIN, et al.,

24 Plaintiffs,

25 vs.

26 META PLATFORMS, INC.,

27 Defendant.

28 This Document Relates To: All Consumer
Actions

Consolidated Case No. 3:20-cv-08570-JD

29 **PLAINTIFFS' OMNIBUS MOTION IN**
LIMINE AND META'S RESPONSES
THERETO

30 The Hon. James Donato

31 Pretrial Conference: September 25, 2025
32 Trial: November 17, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1 NOTICE OF MOTION	3
2 PLAINTIFFS' MIL NO. 1: REFERENCES TO CASE BEING "LAWYER-DRIVEN"	4
3 META'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' MIL NO. 1	7
4 PLAINTIFFS' MIL NO. 2: PLAINTIFFS' PERSONAL AND INTIMATE LIFE DETAILS	10
5 META'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' MIL NO. 2	12
6 PLAINTIFFS' MIL NO. 3: AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATION SEQUENCE.....	15
7 META'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' MIL NO. 3	17
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

NOTICE OF MOTION

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

3 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on September 25, 2025, or as soon thereafter as may be heard,
4 Plaintiffs will move the Court, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Evidence, for orders in *limine* to
5 preclude Meta from:

- Offering evidence or argument as to this case’s origins or asserting it is “lawyer driven”;
- Offering evidence or making arguments relating to subjects that are minimally, if at all, probative of the Plaintiffs’ claims and that may embarrass, annoy, intimidate, or otherwise harass Plaintiffs at trial;
- Affirmatively offering video testimony of any witness by designation during Plaintiffs case-in-chief;

3 This Motion is based on this Notice of Motion, Memorandum of Points and Authorities, and
4 all matters with respect to which this Court may take judicial notice, and such oral and documentary
5 evidence as may be presented to the Court at the time of or before the hearing.

1 **PLAINTIFFS' MIL NO. 1: REFERENCES TO CASE BEING "LAWYER-DRIVEN"**

2 Throughout this litigation, Meta has inappropriately characterized this litigation as lawyer-
 3 driven. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 670 at 2, 24 (Meta referring to Plaintiffs as being “before the court only
 4 because” they were “recruited by their lawyer friends”); 806 at 24 (Meta referring to a Plaintiff’s
 5 alleged knowledge “before talking to her lawyers” and asserting claims “being advanced by plaintiffs’
 6 counsel”). These allegations are untrue, irrelevant and unfairly prejudicial, and this Court should
 7 exclude any such arguments or evidence under Rules 401, 402, and 403.

8 Evidence or argument regarding this case’s origins, how Plaintiffs came to bring this case, or
 9 Meta’s suggestion that this case is “lawyer driven” does not make it more or less likely that Meta is
 10 a monopolist, that Meta acquired its power via anticompetitive means, that Meta has harmed
 11 competition, and/or that Meta has violated federal antitrust laws. Moreover, permitting Meta to make
 12 this argument would cause unfair prejudice and unnecessary confusion and delay. If Meta were to
 13 advance this argument (however misguided), that would force Plaintiffs’ counsel to respond, creating
 14 a sideshow and mini-trial that has no bearing on any issue. For example, to answer the obvious
 15 questions that would arise in jurors’ minds regarding Plaintiffs’ counsel, Plaintiffs would then need
 16 to introduce evidence about their counsel—*i.e.*, the “lawyers” and firms allegedly driving the lawsuit.
 17 This would risk confusing the jury and would be a complete waste of the Court and jury’s time.

18 For reasons such as these, multiple Courts of Appeal have found such evidence and argument
 19 is properly excluded from trial. For example, in *Koufakis v. Carvel*, the Second Circuit found that
 20 counsel’s references during trial to his adversary’s “trial counsel” were inappropriate and required
 21 remand for a new trial. 425 F.2d 892, 904 (2d Cir. 1970). Similarly, the Seventh Circuit has explained
 22 that “argument aimed at a party’s counsel is improper and risks depriving the party of a fair trial.”
 23 *Stollings v. Ryobi Techs., Inc.*, 725 F.3d 753, 761 (7th Cir. 2013). Indeed, district courts routinely
 24 exclude evidence as to a plaintiff’s motivation for and background in initiating the lawsuit—including
 25 that it is “lawyer driven”—as unfairly prejudicial where, as here, it is not part of the claims or defenses
 26 the jury will decide. *See, e.g.*, *Hart v. RCI Hospitality Holdings, Inc.*, 90 F. Supp. 3d 250, 271-73
 27 (S.D.N.Y. 2015) (finding it “remarkabl[e]” that defendants would even oppose a motion in limine “to
 28 preclude evidence and arguments as to . . . lawyer-driven lawsuits” because “th[at] subject[] [is]

1 categorically irrelevant and ha[s] no place in this lawsuit,” further explaining that “jury’s attitudes
 2 about” counsel’s “business model, role, or ethics . . . have no bearing” on liability and damages
 3 issues); *Corcoran v. CVS Pharmacy, Inc.*, 2021 WL 633809, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 18, 2021) (granting
 4 similar motion because “[c]lass actions are frequently driven by lawyers” and “[Rule 23] exists in
 5 part to address conduct where the value of recovery to an individual would not justify the cost of
 6 suit.”); *Palantir Techs. Inc. v. Abramowitz*, 639 F. Supp. 3d 981, 988 (N.D. Cal. 2022) (“Motive to
 7 sue is irrelevant to any issue”); *Mukherjee v. Children’s Mercy Hosp.*, 2018 WL 1569308, at *3 (W.D.
 8 Mo. Mar. 28, 2018) (granting motion in limine to prohibit defendant from “presenting evidence,
 9 argument, or making inferences about Plaintiff accessing the legal system, obtaining legal counsel,
 10 and filing . . . this lawsuit” and precluding defendant “from arguing or suggesting the matter is lawyer-
 11 driven”); *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Nassiri*, 2013 WL 2394116, at *5 (D. Nev. May 30, 2013) (granting
 12 motion in limine to preclude defendants from offering any evidence or argument “concerning any
 13 supposed wrongful intent or motivation of plaintiffs”); *Tallman v. Freedman Anselmo Lindberg,*
 14 *L.L.C.*, 2013 WL 2631754, at *3 (C.D. Ill. June 12, 2013) (granting motion *in limine* and rejecting
 15 defendant’s argument that “whether Plaintiff has brought this action in bad faith or for an improper
 16 motive,” including for benefit of counsel, “is relevant and impacts the veracity of Plaintiff’s claim”);
 17 *In re Xarelto (Rivaroxaban) Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 2017 WL 11718344, at *2 (E.D. La. Apr. 18, 2017)
 18 (granting motion *in limine* and precluding “argument or evidence that this lawsuit . . . is lawyer-
 19 driven, fabricated or exaggerated by counsel who make money through” such suits”); *In re Urethane*
 20 *Antitrust Litig.*, Case No. 2:04-md-1616-JWL (D. Kan.), Dkt. 2691 at 2 (granting motion *in limine*
 21 “to Preclude Reference to How Class Plaintiffs Became Involved in the Case or to the Case Being
 22 Lawyer Driven”).

23 There is no legitimate reason for Meta to offer commentary on this case being “lawyer driven”
 24 and the like, and the Court should prevent Meta from attempting to do so. To the extent Meta intends
 25 to dispute the veracity of Plaintiffs’ claims, then Meta should do so with evidence and argument
 26 regarding the *substance* of Plaintiffs’ claims. For example, Meta should offer evidence or argument
 27 regarding its views as to: the definition of the relevant market; Meta’s power in that market; whether
 28 Meta obtained and maintained any such power through deception regarding its data privacy practices;

1 and whether Meta has used that power to harm competition and cause Plaintiffs damage. Meta should
2 not, however, be permitted to try Plaintiffs' claims by *innuendo*—*i.e.*, by asserting factual contentions
3 about what **Meta** did or did not do somehow lack merit based on the manner in which Plaintiffs came
4 to file, maintain, and prosecute this case. Meta knows this: it has itself sought an evidentiary
5 stipulation that would limit references during the trial to the parties' counsel or their conduct in this
6 litigation. That is a tacit admission that the focus of trial should be on the parties, not their counsel.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

META'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' MIL NO. 1

The three individuals that remain in this case testified that they joined this litigation as a favor to their lawyer friends, rather than because of any legitimate grievance with Meta. Unsurprisingly, then, plaintiffs' legal filings assert harm from allegedly deceptive statements that they admit they had *never heard*, via the use of free services plaintiffs concededly enjoy and continue to use. Because testimony about how plaintiffs became involved in this litigation directly undermines their credibility, claimed injury, and supposed damages, the motion should be denied.

8 Whether plaintiffs in fact suffered an injury or damages are central issues in this case, and
9 nothing in Rules 401, 402, or 403 precludes evidence bearing on those questions. “[E]vidence relevant
10 to disputed, material issues of fact … may include Plaintiffs’ experiences, including about their
11 discovery of the harm they necessarily allege.” *Rodriguez v. Google LLC*, 2025 WL 2237720, at *2
12 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 6, 2025). A defendant may thus ask a plaintiff “how she became involved in th[e]
13 case and whether she had been dissatisfied with the [at-issue] product before learning of the case,”
14 such as “in an attorney advertisement.” *Id.* (quoting *Montera v. Premier Nutrition Corp.*, 2022 WL
15 1465044, at *1 (N.D. Cal. May 9, 2022)).

16 In response to such questions, the plaintiffs here testified that they *were* satisfied with Meta’s
17 offerings—in fact, plaintiffs uniformly agreed that they received extensive benefits from using Meta’s
18 free services. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 805-4, Klein Tr. 161:4-11 (describing value of events functionality); Dkt.
19 805-13, Grabert Tr. (Vol. 2) 324:13-327:6 (describing “significant value” received). Indeed, one
20 plaintiff testified that she would not “know how to monetize” the value she had obtained, and that she
21 didn’t “think there’s a way to quantify that.” Ex. 1, Kupcho Tr. 55:22-56:9.¹ Having conceded they
22 were not aware of any harm from using Meta’s free services, plaintiffs then explained how they
23 actually came to be involved with this case: Kupcho was approached by her “friend[] since college,”
24 Dkt. 669-2, Kupcho Tr. 60:7-8, Grabert was recruited by “one of [her] husband’s friends from high
25 school,” Dkt. 669-3, Grabert Tr. (Vol. 2) 358:3-4, and Klein became a plaintiff after talking with the
26 best man at his wedding, Dkt. 669-4, Klein Tr. 306:2-3. That these relationships with plaintiffs’

²⁶ ¹ “Ex.” citations reference exhibits to the Gringer Declaration filed with this document.

1 counsel drove plaintiffs' involvement in this litigation is thus probative of plaintiffs' credibility, the
 2 injuries they now allege, and whether they are entitled to damages.

3 Excluding evidence of plaintiffs' motivations for filing this lawsuit would be particularly
 4 inappropriate given that their testimony contradicts key aspects of their counsel's claims. For
 5 example, the plaintiffs testified that they would never accept the payments their lawyers invented and
 6 now seek as damages. Dkt. 925-10, Grabert Tr. (Vol. 2) 322:24-323:7 (“Q. Have you ever—would
 7 you ever agree to sell personal data about yourself in exchange for monetary compensation? A. I don't
 8 know what data you're talking about. Q. Any data. Any personal data about yourself, would you sell
 9 it for money? A. No.”); Dkt. 925-8, Klein Tr. 290:11-20 (same); Dkt. 925-11, Kupcho Tr. 234:16-19
 10 (“Q. Would you ever agree to sell personal data about yourself in exchange for monetary
 11 compensation? A. No.”). Such discrepancies undermine plaintiffs' credibility and bear directly on
 12 their injury and damages theories, and can only be explained by reference to the manner plaintiffs
 13 were recruited. There is nothing prejudicial about plaintiffs being asked to explain why their asserted
 14 injuries were only discovered after they were recruited to be plaintiffs in this case, and how it came
 15 to be that they are asking for payments they conceded under oath they would not accept.

16 Plaintiffs' string cite of largely out-of-circuit law does not suggest otherwise. *Koufakis v.*
 17 *Carvel*, for example, involved arguments that were “outside the record.” 425 F.2d 892, 904 (2d Cir.
 18 1970). In *Stollings v. Ryobi Technologies, Inc.*, the defendant raised an argument that was “not
 19 relevant to any issue in dispute,” suggesting that counsel had an improper motive for bringing the
 20 case. 725 F.3d 753, 761 (7th Cir. 2013). And *In re Xarelto (Rivaroxaban) Products Liability*
 21 *Litigation* similarly dealt with counsel's motivation. 2017 WL 11718344, at *2 (E.D. La. Apr. 18,
 22 2017). Here, the testimony at issue concerns plaintiffs' own motivations, and the deeply contested
 23 issue of whether they suffered harm or damages. Indeed, one of plaintiffs' cited cases—*Mukherjee v.*
 24 *Children's Mercy Hospital*—specifically did not preclude defendant from “properly challenging
 25 [p]laintiff's credibility” by offering evidence about “[t]he reasons why [p]laintiff made and continues
 26 to make the allegations in th[e] lawsuit.” 2018 WL 1569308, at *3 (W.D. Mo. Mar. 28, 2018). That
 27 is precisely the kind of testimony that Meta will elicit at trial.

28 Plaintiffs' in-circuit citations are likewise inapposite. *Palantir Technologies Inc. v.*

1 *Abramowitz* held only that plaintiff's "[m]otive to sue is irrelevant to any issue in *this case*." 639 F.
 2 Supp. 3d 981, 988 (N.D. Cal. 2022) (emphasis added). *Allstate Insurance Co. v. Nassiri* expressly
 3 permitted testimony about plaintiffs' pre-suit "investigation" and "what information plaintiffs had
 4 when they decided to bring this lawsuit," so as to "not impact any of the ... defendants' defenses that
 5 relate to the pre-litigation investigation." 2013 WL 2394116, at *5 (D. Nev. May 30, 2013). And in
 6 *Corcoran v. CVS Pharmacy, Inc.*, the court addressed whether "lawyer-driven" arguments were
 7 appropriate at class certification, not the scope of permissible testimony at trial in a case being
 8 litigated only by individuals. 2021 WL 633809, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 18, 2021). Plaintiffs' record
 9 citations similarly concern arguments at class certification that are no longer relevant, Pls. Mot. at 4,
 10 and the fact that plaintiffs are atypical and inadequate representatives is distinct from their failure to
 11 credibly assert injury or damages.

12 At bottom, plaintiffs testified that they were not harmed and rejected the damages measure
 13 their counsel seeks to put in front of the jury, instead explaining that they are prosecuting this suit
 14 because they have close personal relationships with the lawyers who developed it. Jurors should be
 15 permitted to evaluate what if any of plaintiffs' contentions are credible on that full record.

16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

1 **PLAINTIFFS' MIL NO. 2: PLAINTIFFS' PERSONAL AND INTIMATE LIFE DETAILS**

2 Meta should be precluded from offering evidence or making arguments relating to subjects
 3 that are minimally, if at all, probative of the Plaintiffs' claims and that may embarrass, annoy,
 4 intimidate, or otherwise harass Plaintiffs at trial. During discovery, Meta sought highly invasive
 5 discovery from Plaintiffs bearing on their personal and intimate life details but which have minimal
 6 (if any) relevance on Plaintiffs' contentions in this case or their suitability as Plaintiffs. Such evidence
 7 or argument has no place at trial and should be excluded.

8 Defendants have, on multiple occasions, confronted Plaintiffs with highly personal, irrelevant,
 9 and embarrassing documents or information that have little probative value vis-a-vis the claims or
 10 defenses in this action. As one notable example, during deposition, [REDACTED]

11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. Apparently, Meta has
 14 sought to introduce similar personal evidence against plaintiffs in other litigation before this Court.
 15 See, e.g., *Frasco v. Flo Health, Inc.*, Case No. 3:21-cv-00757-JD, Dkt. 674 (N.D. Cal. June 20, 2025)
 16 (request for in *limine* given Meta proffered documents for trial relating to plaintiff's "PPP loans" and
 17 "tabloid articles about [plaintiff's] sexual relationships.").

18 Under the Federal Rules of Evidence, admissible evidence must be relevant to the claims or
 19 defenses of the case. Fed. R. Evid. 402 ("Irrelevant evidence is not admissible."). Evidence is relevant
 20 only if it has "any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the
 21 determination of the action more probable than it would be without the evidence." Fed. R. Evid. 401.
 22 And even if evidence is relevant to a case, it must still be excluded if its "probative value is
 23 substantially outweighed" by a risk of "unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the jury,
 24 undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly presenting cumulative evidence." Fed. R. Evid. 403.

25 Meta cannot show that named Plaintiffs' intimate personal lives and details [REDACTED]
 26 [REDACTED]—are relevant to the claims and defense of the case, or
 27 that any hypothetical relevance of such information is not substantially outweighed by unfair
 28 prejudice, harassment, and embarrassment. The only supposed "relevance" that Meta has ever offered

1 for such information is that it supposedly indicates Plaintiffs “do not care” about collection and use
2 of their data. But whatever users’ privacy settings on these unrelated services may be, they could just
3 as easily be a function of privacy settings being difficult to navigate or configured in a certain manner.
4 Moreover, as Plaintiffs have repeatedly explained, what matters in an antitrust case is whether **enough**
5 users cared to a sufficient degree about the extent of a personal social network’s data collection and
6 use, such that Meta’s data-related deception of the market harmed competition. *See* Dkt. 793. In other
7 words, the individual Plaintiffs’ preferences are **not** relevant. Additionally, to the extent, for example,
8 Meta’s position is that Plaintiffs somehow do not care about their privacy or data because they
9 “consent” (or do not police) to collection and use of their data in connection with [REDACTED]
10 [REDACTED], consent for one [REDACTED] does not mean consent for all (Meta). In any event, even
11 were the individual Plaintiffs’ [REDACTED] —
12 somehow pertinent (they are not), Meta can make the same (misguided) arguments with other, far
13 less prejudicial materials: *e.g.*, documents and questioning regarding Plaintiffs’ use of, and privacy
14 settings on, other services and devices (including Twitter, YouTube, Pinterest, TikTok, Apple iOS or
15 the other scores of less inflammatory sources regarding which Meta took extensive discovery and
16 engaged in substantial questioning). *See, e.g., Lee v. Lampert*, 607 F. Supp. 2d 1204 (D. Or. 2009)
17 (acknowledging “disclosure of intimate details about their private lives” may be “embarrassing” to
18 witnesses); *Borges v. City of Hollister*, 2005 WL 6019704, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 24, 2005)
19 (“Defendants shall not be permitted to introduce evidence concerning plaintiffs’ ‘sexual history.’”).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

META'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' MIL NO. 2

2 Plaintiffs’ assertion that Meta should be prohibited from “offering evidence or making
3 arguments relating to subjects that are minimally, if at all, probative of the Plaintiffs’ claims and that
4 may embarrass, annoy, intimidate, or otherwise harass Plaintiffs at trial,” Pls. Mot. at 10, essentially
5 just restates Federal Rule of Evidence 403 and is so overbroad as to be meaningless. *United States v.*
6 *Wolfenbarger*, 2021 WL 3212833, at *1 (N.D. Cal. July 29, 2021) (the court should not “exclude
7 broad swaths of evidence at a high level of generality”). Motions *in limine* “must identify the evidence
8 at issue and state with specificity why such evidence is inadmissible.” *Colton Crane Co. v. Terex*
9 *Cranes Wilmington, Inc.*, 2010 WL 2035800, at *1 (C.D. Cal. May 19, 2010). Plaintiffs’ motion fails
10 to meet this standard; instead, it refers generally to Meta’s use of “Plaintiffs’ intimate personal lives
11 and details,” and [REDACTED]

12 [REDACTED] Pls. Mot. at 10-11. As discussed below, even this supposedly notable example is not
13 remotely what plaintiffs suggest it to be. But given its lack of specificity, plaintiffs' request would do
14 little to "streamline [the] trial[]," by settling evidentiary disputes in advance and by minimizing side-
15 bar conferences and other disruptions at trial." *Colton Crane*, 2010 WL 2035800, at *1. Rather than
16 barring Meta from offering evidence or "making arguments" related to undefined categories like
17 "Plaintiffs' intimate personal lives and details" and "subjects that are minimally, if at all, probative
18 of the plaintiffs' claims and that may embarrass, annoy, intimidate, or otherwise harass Plaintiffs at
19 trial," Pls. Mot. at 10, the Court should deny plaintiffs' motion and wait to rule on the admissibility
20 of any such evidence "until trial so that questions of foundation, relevancy, and potential prejudice
21 may be resolved in proper context," *Mendoza v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.*, 2021 WL 1893083, at *1
22 (N.D. Cal. May 11, 2021).

23 To the extent the motion does raise “examples” of the categories of testimony or evidence
24 plaintiffs seek to preclude, none warrant exclusion. The probative value of testimony and evidence of
25 plaintiffs’ online privacy preferences—*especially* on websites known to have lesser privacy
26 protections, like pornographic sites—far outweighs any risk of prejudice. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 403.

27 *First*, plaintiffs cannot now object to the introduction of evidence directly relevant to the
28 privacy preferences they assert caused the alleged deception to harm competition. All examples

1 plaintiffs identify relate to their online privacy preferences, a subject they have directly *put in*
 2 *controversy* by claiming that Meta manipulated the market through representations about its privacy
 3 practices. Plaintiffs argue such manipulation was enabled because “privacy and data are important to
 4 [plaintiffs] and affected their use of Facebook.” Dkt. 952-1, Pls. Mot. Summ. J. Opp. at 14. Allowing
 5 them to object to the introduction of evidence directly relevant to the privacy preferences that *they*
 6 assert caused the alleged deception to harm competition violates fundamental fairness principles and
 7 would prejudice Meta’s presentation to the jury.

8 Plaintiffs’ case turns on the claim that social media users—including plaintiffs—decide which
 9 websites to use and what information to share based on those sites’ representations about “privacy.”
 10 *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 805, Pls. Renewed Class Cert. Mot. at 1. If plaintiffs intend to testify at trial regarding
 11 the importance of Meta’s representations about “privacy” to their decision to use (and continue using)
 12 the platform over other competitors, as they must to satisfy the *Harcourt-Brace* factors, Federal Rule
 13 of Evidence 607 permits Meta to ask questions and introduce countervailing evidence to impeach the
 14 credibility of those claims. *See United States v. Castillo*, 181 F.3d 1129, 1132-1133 (9th Cir. 1999)
 15 (Rule 607 allows for impeachment of witness’ “errors or falsehoods” by contradiction, including
 16 through introduction of “extrinsic evidence”). Questioning and evidence related to plaintiffs’
 17 willingness to use other websites without concern for—or even awareness of—the privacy settings
 18 on those sites, and indeed their willingness to share “intimate” personal details on those sites, is
 19 directly relevant to the credibility of their claims regarding the importance of “privacy.”

20 **Second**, the particular websites that plaintiffs used without regard to privacy protections—
 21 ██████████—directly undermine their claims. To be clear, Meta will not
 22 intimidate or harass any witness at trial, whether through irrelevant questions or any other means, as
 23 Meta explained in conferring with plaintiffs’ counsel. However, to the extent plaintiffs seek to exclude
 24 evidence related to plaintiffs’ use of non-Meta websites with notoriously poor privacy protections,
 25 that material is probative of core issues: the data plaintiffs share with other websites, their sensitivities
 26 about privacy, and their Facebook privacy settings. For example, plaintiff Kupcho admitted that she
 27 does not check or does not know the privacy policies and settings for a variety of websites and
 28 applications that she uses, ██████████

1 [REDACTED]. Notwithstanding plaintiffs' claim that the probative
2 value of this information is substantially outweighed by the risk of "unfair prejudice, harassment, and
3 embarrassment" that the materials present, evidence related to plaintiffs' use of other websites—
4 [REDACTED]—is relevant and admissible precisely *because* it shows that plaintiffs are
5 unconcerned about privacy even when sharing personal information that is significantly more
6 sensitive than what they share on Facebook, and even when using sites that are known to be less
7 secure.

8 Plaintiffs claim this evidence is not relevant to whether "*enough* users cared" about privacy
9 to affect competition, Pls. Mot. at 11, but cannot dispute that evidence regarding the privacy
10 preferences of the actual plaintiffs in this litigation—those before the jury—is probative of the
11 importance of privacy settings to all users, as well as to the specific users claiming to have been
12 harmed by Meta's privacy practices in this case. *Cf. Hill v. Nat'l Collegiate Athletic Ass'n*, 865 P.2d
13 633, 648 (Cal. 1994) (plaintiff claiming invasion of privacy based on "objective" expectation of
14 privacy standard "must have conducted himself or herself in a manner consistent with an actual
15 expectation of privacy"). And indeed, this is no longer a class action. What matters now is the three
16 plaintiffs before the Court and eventually the jury. Evidence that undermines their core theory of
17 liability is probative and excluding it would be unduly prejudicial to Meta.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 **PLAINTIFFS' MIL NO. 3: AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATION SEQUENCE**

2 Trial in this case is likely to feature some witnesses testifying by video deposition. To afford
 3 each side fair and equal latitude to present their respective cases and avoid confusion and undue
 4 prejudice, Plaintiffs proposed that to the extent a party intends to affirmatively offer video testimony
 5 of a witness by designation, such video testimony will be played during *that* party's case-in-chief.
 6 For example, if Plaintiffs offer deposition designations for a witness and Meta then offers affirmative
 7 counter-designations for that witness, then Plaintiffs' designations shall be played in Plaintiffs' case-
 8 in-chief, and Meta's counter-designations shall be played in Meta's case-in-chief. Meta refused.

9 Courts have recognized, for example, a "presumption" that "the plaintiff, in a typical case,
 10 should be allowed to present her case in the order she chooses." *Sensitron, Inc. v. Wallace*, 504 F.
 11 Supp. 2d 1180, 1186 (D. Utah 2007). That extends to depositions, such that "a party's presentation of
 12 a case ought not to be unduly interrupted or distracted" by the other side's affirmative deposition
 13 designations. *Blue Cross & Blue Shield of New Jersey, Inc. v. Philip Morris, Inc.*, 199 F.R.D. 487,
 14 490 (E.D.N.Y. 2001). Indeed, requiring Plaintiffs to include in their *own* case-in-chief all of Meta's
 15 affirmative designations would compromise Plaintiffs' ability to present their case as they see fit. It
 16 would, for example, allow Meta to include designations on unrelated topics, confusing the import of
 17 the deponent witness's testimony to Plaintiff's case-in-chief and unduly lengthening the video portion
 18 of Plaintiffs' presentation. All of this could, in turn, cause the jury to lose interest and then hold that
 19 against Plaintiffs, when it is Meta that is the imprimatur for playing the video testimony all at once.

20 During the parties' meet-and-confer, Meta's only justification for its refusing Plaintiffs'
 21 proposal was Meta's view that "that is not how video designations are done" at trial. Facebook is
 22 incorrect. Courts regularly order each parties to play their affirmative deposition designations for a
 23 given witness in *their own* respective case-in-chief, except for limited counter-designations for
 24 completeness. *See, e.g., Blue Cross*, 199 F.R.D. at 489, 491 (ordering that "plaintiff will be permitted
 25 to play the portions [of video depositions] it wishes in its case-in-chief without counter-designations"
 26 and "defendants may do the same in their case after the plaintiff rests"); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P.
 27 32(a)(6) (explaining that "[i]f a party offers in evidence only part of a deposition, *an adverse party*
 28 *may require the offeror to introduce other parts that in fairness should be considered* with the part

1 introduced, and any party may *itself* introduce any other parts.”) (emphases added). To be clear,
2 Plaintiffs are not seeking to preclude Meta from playing the deposition testimony it wishes to,
3 assuming that testimony is otherwise admissible. Instead, Plaintiffs simply require that Meta be
4 required to do so in its own case-in-chief, as is routinely done.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

META'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' MIL NO. 3

2 Plaintiffs' proposal for introducing videotaped deposition testimony is premature,
3 inconsistent with usual practice, and unhelpful to the jury. Even setting aside that the parties have
4 not exchanged deposition designations yet—rendering concerns about “confusion” or “prejudice”
5 entirely speculative—the claim that “[c]ourts regularly order each parties [sic] to play their
6 affirmative deposition designations for a given witness in their own respective case-in-chief, except
7 for limited counter-designations for completeness,” is betrayed by plaintiffs’ own citation. Pls. Mot.
8 at 21 (emphasis omitted). A single out-of-circuit case from nearly 25 years ago does not demonstrate
9 a regular practice in any jurisdiction, much less this one. *Id.* As is the (actually) typical practice and
10 in accordance with how live testimony will be presented, the parties should play all testimony from
11 a given witness at one time—in the order which it was given. Plaintiffs’ proposal (which is not
12 properly a motion *in limine*) will result in stilted and choppy testimony played days apart.

13 Playing all testimony at once promotes efficiency, prevents jury confusion, and reduces the
14 risk that deposition testimony is treated differently than live testimony. Unsurprisingly, that is how
15 courts across the country typically structure the playing of deposition testimony. *See, e.g., Epic*
16 *Games, Inc. v. Apple Inc.*, 2021 WL 2350812, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 21, 2021) (“To the extent that
17 the parties play a witness’s deposition designations at trial, all portions of the testimony designated
18 by any party will be played at the same time All designated testimony will be introduced in the
19 sequence in which the testimony was originally given.”); *In re Gen. Motors LLC Ignition Switch*
20 *Litig.*, 2017 WL 2829693, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Jun. 30, 2017) (recognizing that playing both parties’
21 deposition designations at the same time in chronological order “promote[s] efficiency”);
22 *Microspherix LLC v. Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp.*, 2023 WL 6613306, at *11 (D.N.J. Oct. 5, 2023)
23 (ordering that “[a]ll portions of the testimony designated by any party will be played at the same
24 time, including the parties’ affirmative designations and counter-designations. All designated
25 testimony will be introduced in the sequence in which the testimony was originally given.”).

26 This Court’s regular practice of ordering that live witnesses testify only once is also
27 instructive, and recognizes that the jury benefits from having all testimony from an individual
28 presented at the same time. *See, e.g.*, Pretrial Order at 6, *In re Google Play Store Antitrust Litig.*,

1 Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD (N.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2023) (Donato, J.), Dkt. 700 (“Witnesses will be
 2 put on the witness stand only once.”); Pretrial Order at 3, *Frasco v. Flo Health, Inc.*, Case No. 3:21-
 3 cv-00757-JD (N.D. Cal. June 27, 2025) (Donato, J.), Dkt. 692 (same). Chopping up testimony
 4 compromises the jury’s ability to weigh a witness’s credibility across the entirety of their testimony
 5 and needlessly necessitates reintroducing witnesses to provide context. Permitting deposition
 6 testimony to be introduced in parts while having live witnesses testify once also risks confusing the
 7 jury as to why witnesses testifying by deposition are being treated differently—a concern that is
 8 particularly acute in this case, which involves numerous Meta employees and nonparties outside of
 9 the Court’s subpoena power.

10 The principle of completeness confirms that all testimony should be given together. The
 11 Rules of Civil Procedure state that after a party has offered part of a deposition into evidence, the
 12 opposing party “may require the offeror to introduce other parts that in fairness should be considered
 13 with the part introduced, and any party may itself introduce any other parts.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 32(a)(6);
 14 *see Phoenix Techs. Ltd. v. VMware, Inc.*, 2017 WL 2001981, at *10 (N.D. Cal. May 11, 2017) (“To
 15 the extent the rule of completeness requires the parties to play designated and counter-designated
 16 deposition videos simultaneously, the parties are ordered to do so.”); 8A Charles Alan Wright &
 17 Arthur R. Miller, *Federal Practice & Procedure* §2148 (3d ed. 1998 & Jun. 2024 update) (under Rule
 18 32(a)(6), introducing both parties’ designations at the same time avoids the “danger” that the
 19 testimony “will be misinterpreted by selective use of portions … out of context or with qualifications
 20 … omitted.”). Rule of Evidence 106 similarly states that, “[i]f a party introduces all or part of a
 21 statement, an adverse party may require the introduction, at that time, of any other part—or any
 22 other statement—that in fairness ought to be considered at the same time.” Specific application of
 23 the completeness rules remains premature (like plaintiffs’ motion) but the principle again favors
 24 treating deposition testimony the same way as live witnesses. At minimum, Meta’s counter-
 25 designations must be played at the same time pursuant to Rule 106; given that, it is most helpful to
 26 the jury and efficient for the trial proceeding for Meta’s own affirmative designations (and plaintiffs’
 27 counters) to be played at the same time.

28 Taken together, playing depositions a single time would permit the jury to “hear from each

1 witness only once,” and obviate the “need to remind the jury who the witness is, or replay what the
2 jury heard before.” *Kraft Foods Glob., Inc. v. United Egg Producers, Inc.*, 2023 WL 6248266, at *4
3 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 19, 2023). Plaintiffs’ contrary approach would require “refreshers [that] would take
4 time,” and “test the jury’s ability to remember what the witness has said before.” *Id.* at *3. On the
5 other side of the ledger rests only plaintiffs’ speculation. The Court should deny the motion.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 DATED: September 11, 2025

2 By: /s/ Shana E. Scarlett

3 **HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP**
 4 Shana E. Scarlett (Bar No. 217895)
 shanas@hbsslaw.com
 715 Hearst Avenue, Suite 202
 Berkeley, CA 94710
 5 (510) 725-3000

6 Steve W. Berman (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 7 steve@hbsslaw.com
 1301 Second Avenue, Suite 2000
 Seattle, WA 98101
 8 (206) 623-7292

9 **LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN P.L.L.P.**

10 W. Joseph Bruckner (admitted *pro hac*
 vice)
 11 wjbruckner@locklaw.com
 Robert K. Shelquist (admitted *pro hac*
 12 vice)
 rkshelquist@locklaw.com
 13 Brian D. Clark (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 bdclark@locklaw.com
 14 Laura M. Matson (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 lmmatson@locklaw.com
 15 100 Washington Avenue South, Suite
 2200
 16 Minneapolis, MN 55401
 (612) 339-6900

17 Kyle Pozan (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 18 kjpozan@locklaw.com
 1165 N Clark Street, Suite 700
 19 Chicago, IL 60610
 (312) 470-4333

20 By: /s/ Kevin Y. Teruya

21 **QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP**
 22 Kevin Y. Teruya (Bar No. 235916)
 kevinteruya@quinnmanuel.com
 Adam B. Wolfson (Bar No. 262125)
 adamwolfson@quinnmanuel.com
 23 Scott L. Watson (Bar No. 219147)
 scottwatson@quinnmanuel.com
 Claire D. Hausman (Bar No. 282091)
 clairehausman@quinnmanuel.com
 Brantley I. Pepperman (Bar No. 322057)
 24 brantleypepperman@quinnmanuel.com
 865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90017-2543
 (213) 443-3000

25 Michelle Schmit (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 26 michelleschmit@quinnmanuel.com
 191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
 Chicago, IL 60606-1881
 (312) 705-7400

27 Manisha M. Sheth (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 28 manishasheth@quinnmanuel.com
 295 5th Avenue, 9th Floor
 New York, New York 10016
 (212) 849-7000

30 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs Maximilian Klein,*
 31 *Rachel Banks Kupcho, and Sarah Grabert*

1 DATED: September 11, 2025
2

3 By: /s/ Sonal N. Mehta
4

5 **WILMER CUTLER PICKERING**
6

7 **HALE AND DORR LLP**
8

9 Sonal N. Mehta (SBN 222086)
10

11 Sonal.Mehta@wilmerhale.com
12 2600 El Camino Real, Suite 400
13 Palo Alto, California 94306
14 Telephone: (650) 858-6000
15

16 David Z. Gringer (*pro hac vice*)
17 David.Gringer@wilmerhale.com
18

19 Paul Vanderslice (*pro hac vice*)
20 Paul.Vanderslice@wilmerhale.com
21 7 World Trade Center
22 250 Greenwich Street
23 New York, New York 10007
24 Telephone: (212) 230-8800
25

26 Molly M. Jennings (*pro hac vice*)
27 Molly.Jennings@wilmerhale.com
28 2100 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, DC 20037
Telephone: (202) 663-6000
29

30 *Attorneys for Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.*
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
8010
8011
8012
8013
8014
8015
8016
8017
8018
8019
8020
8021
8022
8023
8024
8025
8026
8027
8028
8029
8030
8031
8032
8033
8034
8035
8036
8037
8038
8039
8040
8041
8042
8043
8044
8045
8046
8047
8048
8049
8050
8051
8052
8053
8054
8055
8056
8057
8058
8059
8060
8061
8062
8063
8064
8065
8066
8067
8068
8069
8070
8071
8072
8073
8074
8075
8076
8077
8078
8079
8080
8081
8082
8083
8084
8085
8086
8087
8088
8089
8090
8091
8092
8093
8094
8095
8096
8097
8098
8099
80100
80101
80102
80103
80104
80105
80106
80107
80108
80109
80110
80111
80112
80113
80114
80115
80116
80117
80118
80119
80120
80121
80122
80123
80124
80125
80126
80127
80128
80129
80130
80131
80132
80133
80134
80135
80136
80137
80138
80139
80140
80141
80142
80143
80144
80145
80146
80147
80148
80149
80150
80151
80152
80153
80154
80155
80156
80157
80158
80159
80160
80161
80162
80163
80164
80165
80166
80167
80168
80169
80170
80171
80172
80173
80174
80175
80176
80177
80178
80179
80180
80181
80182
80183
80184
80185
80186
80187
80188
80189
80190
80191
80192
80193
80194
80195
80196
80197
80198
80199
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80293
80294
80295
80296
80297
80298
80299
80200
80201
80202
80203
80204
80205
80206
80207
80208
80209
80210
80211
80212
80213
80214
80215
80216
80217
80218
80219
80220
80221
80222
80223
80224
80225
80226
80227
80228
80229
80230
80231
80232
80233
80234
80235
80236
80237
80238
80239
80240
80241
80242
80243
80244
80245
80246
80247
80248
80249
80250
80251
80252
80253
80254
80255
80256
80257
80258
80259
80260
80261
80262
80263
80264
80265
80266
80267
80268
80269
80270
80271
80272
80273
80274
80275
80276
80277
80278
80279
80280
80281
80282
80283
80284
80285
80286
80287
80288
80289
80290
80291
80292
80

1 **ATTESTATION OF KEVIN Y. TERUYA**

2 This document is being filed through the Electronic Case Filing (ECF) system by attorney
3 Kevin Y. Teruya. By his signature, Mr. Teruya attests that he has obtained concurrence in the filing
4 of this document from each of the attorneys identified on the caption page and in the above signature
5 block.

6 Dated: September 11, 2025

7 By */s/ Kevin Y. Teruya*
Kevin Y. Teruya

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28